



**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICY SPECIAL COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTICE**



**June 28, 2011
1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.**

**777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

Douglas Sale, Acting
Executive Director

Mission Statement

“Our mission is to provide advice, counsel and recommendations to the full California Workforce Investment Board that improve Local Workforce Investment Boards’ ability to provide world-class services to constituents; and to provide overall strategic recommendations to the full Board in identifying the most critical priorities.”

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. Update – Employment Development Department Report**
- 3. Action Items**
 - a. Approval of April 5, 2011 Meeting Summary
- 4. Discussion**
 - a. State Board Meeting - Outreach Strategy
 - b. Strategic Planning - Identification of Committee Work and Initiatives
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. Other Business**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the Committee to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.cwib.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information.

To join the online meeting (Now from iPhones and other Smartphones too!)

-
1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=148449287&UID=0&PW=NNmI0MDQwZjRi&RT=MiM0>
 2. Enter your name and email address.
 3. Enter the meeting password: cwib777
 4. Click "Join Now".

To view in other time zones or languages, please click the link:

<https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=148449287&UID=0&PW=NNmI0MDQwZjRi&ORT=MiM0>

To join the teleconference only

Call-in toll-free number (Verizon): 1-866-748-2780 (US)
Call-in number (Verizon): 1-866-748-2780 (US)
Attendee access code: 613 254 1

- I. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- II. Update – Employment Development Department Report**
- III. Action Items**
 - **Approval of April 5, 2011 Meeting Summary**

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

AB 15 – CA Renewable Energy Workforce Readiness Initiative

Introduced December 6, 2010, by Assembly Member V. Manuel Perez

This bill would require the State Board to consult with the Green Collar Jobs Council (GCJC), and establish the California Renewable Energy Workforce Readiness Initiative (Initiative) by July 1, 2012. AB 15 would require the State Board to assist the Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) in collecting and analyzing data and report implementation of the initiative to the Legislature by January 1, 2014. This bill has been resurrected from several previous versions: AB 2628 (2010) and AB 3 (2009).

AB 15 had been located in the Assembly Committee on Labor and Employment since January 24, 2011, but died (failed deadline, pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2)) on May 10, 2011.

Support: Unknown

Oppose: Unknown

AB 554 – Employment: Workforce Services

Introduced February 16, 2011, by Assembly Member Atkins

This bill seeks to ensure programs and services funded by WIA and directed to apprenticeable occupations will be coordinated with one or more apprenticeship programs approved by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DASP) for the occupation and geographic area. The bill also requires collaborative policies to be developed between the State Board, each LWIB, community colleges and approved regional apprenticeship programs, to provide specified training and education.

AB 554 is scheduled to be heard by the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 27, 2011.

Support: State Building and Construction Trades Council of CA (Sponsor)

CA Labor Federation

Oppose: None

AB 557 – Veterans: National Guard: California Interagency Council on Veteran Services and Programs

Introduced February 16, 2011, by Assembly Members John Perez, Cook, and Pan

Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Blumenfield

Co-authors: Assembly Members Allen, Atkins, Block, and Williams

This bill would create the California Interagency Council on Veteran Services and Programs (Council). The Council is to be comprised of specific members, for the purposes of bringing together key state agencies and departments, federal officials, legislative representatives, local governments, and stakeholder organizations. This group is to ensure the state's programs that serve veterans are efficiently administered and are

properly integrated. The State Board would be required to serve as a member of the Council.

AB 557 is scheduled to be heard by the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs on June 28, 2011

Support: American Legion, Department of CA
AMVETS CA
Vietnam Veterans of America, CA State Council
Swords to Plowshares
Veterans Village of San Diego
CA State Commanders Veterans Council
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of CA
CA Association of Veteran Service Agencies
Military Officers Association of America, CA Council of Chapters
CA Association of Veterans Service Officers
United States Veterans Initiative
Vietnam Veterans of CA, Inc.
New Directions, Inc.

Oppose: None

SB 698 – Workforce Development: High-Performance Boards

Introduced February 18, 2011, by Senator Lieu

Amended May 31, 2011

This bill would require the Governor to establish, through the State Board, standards for certification of high-performance LWIBs, in accordance with specified criteria. The bill would also require the Governor and the Legislature to consult with the State Board to reserve specified federal discretionary fund for high-performance LWIBs. The State Board will be required to establish a policy for the allocation of the funds.

SB 698 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly Committee on Labor and Employment on July 6, 2011.

Support: CA Labor Federation (Sponsor)
CA Official Court Reporters Association (Sponsor)
CA Manufacturers & Technology Association (Sponsor)
State Building Trades and Construction Trades Council (Sponsor)
CA Conference of Machinists
CA Teachers Association
CA Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Engineers and Scientists of CA
International Longshore and Warehouse Union
UNITE HERE!
CA Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21
United Food and Commercial Workers – Western States Conference

Oppose: None

SB 776 – Workforce Development: Training Services

Introduced February 18, 2011, by Assembly Member DeSaulnier

Amended June 16, 2011

This bill would require Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) to spend a specified percentage of available federal funds for adults and dislocated worker on direct client services, workforce training programs, supportive services and other specified services in ways consistent with federal law. Beginning federal program year 2012, LWIBs must spend at least 20% of Title I funds; federal program year 2014, LWIBs must spend at least 30% of Title I funds; federal program year 2016, LWIBs must spend at least 40% of Title I funds. Further, an LWIB that does not meet the required expenditure requirements will be required to submit a corrective action plan to the EDD. Because the bill places new duties and responsibilities on the LWIBs, it imposes a state-mandated local program. The CA Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies for certain costs and specifies procedures for reimbursement. SB 776 does not provide for reimbursement of the costs, but recognizes that local agencies may pursue any available remedies to seek reimbursement. In federal program year 2015, the State Board will be required to evaluate the effectiveness of the training expenditure mandates, including the increase in the number of individuals receiving some of the defined training services, and training-related placements.

SB 776 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly Committee on Labor and Employment on June 22, 2011.

Support: CA Labor Federation (Sponsor)

State Building and Construction Trades Council (Sponsor)

CA Manufacturers & Technology Association (Sponsor)

CA Teachers Association

Service Employees International Union

Council of Goodwill Industries

City of Los Angeles WIB

Los Angeles County WIB

Oppose: CA Workforce Association

County of San Bernardino

Orange County Board of Supervisors

CA State Association of Counties

Regional Council of Rural Counties

Marin County Board of Supervisors

Urban Counties Caucus

City of Glendora

Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce

San Diego Workforce Partnership

South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce

Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
City of Covina
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau
California Steel Industries, Inc.
Brawley Inn
Vietnam Veterans of CA, Inc.
Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors
Watts Labor Community Action Committee
Ahn Fielding
Bus-Ed Partners, Inc.
City of Azusa
Colusa County One Stop
Community Career Development, Inc.
Edwin Smith
Exchange Bank
Henkels and McCoy, Inc.
Hub Cities Consortium
Imperial County Workforce Development Board
Joseph Derthick, SELACO WIB Business Representative
Jewish Vocational Services
Kaiser Permanente Santa Rosa Medical Center
Merced County Office of Education
Merced County WIB
New Horizons
P&L Specialties
Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment – PACE
Performance, Productivity and Profit Consulting
Rainier Properties, LLC
Riverside County Board of Supervisors and Economic Development Agency
Riverside County WIB
Santa Cruz County WIB
SHN Consulting Engineers and Geologists, Inc.
Solano County WIB
Sonoma County Employment and Training Division
Southeast Area Social Services Funding Authority
Southeast Los Angeles County WIB
Southern CA Workforce Partnership
Stonewood Center
Supervisor Peter Huebner, Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Wendy Otto, Trinity County Board of Supervisors
Tom Beard Company
Violette Maquique
Workforce Institute
Yap & Little, Inc.
Chicana Service Action Center

AB 1115 – Workforce Development: Training Services

Introduced February 18, 2011, by Assembly Member Lara

This bill would authorize any eligible individual to receive training services from any of the eligible training providers from any Local Workforce Investment Area (LWIA) in the state. The State Board would be required to establish a procedure for determining provider eligibility for the LWIBs.

AB 1115 is scheduled to be heard by the Senate Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations on June 29, 2011.

Support: CA Labor Federation (Sponsor)

State Building and Construction Trades Council (Sponsor)

California Manufacturers & Technology Association (Sponsor)

Community College League of CA

Oppose: Western Electrical Contractors Association

Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association of CA

AB 1233 – State Government: Economic Development

Introduced February 18, 2011, by Assembly Member V. Manuel Perez

AB 1233 would make changes to the preparation of the required California Economic Strategy Plan, rename the plan to the California Economic and Workforce Development Strategy (Strategy), and revise some of the specified content. Additionally, the bill would assign new duties to the Secretary of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) and the Economic Strategy Panel (ESP), and revise current responsibilities of both. The State Board would be required to consult with the LWDA to develop the Strategy.

This bill has been in the Assembly Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy since March 21, 2011. The May 5, 2011 hearing was postponed by the Committee.

Support: Unknown

Oppose: Unknown

AB 1310 – Education: Career Technical Education and Workforce Development

Introduced on February 18, 2011 by Assembly Member Furutani

Amended on May 27, 2011

The bill would require the Secretary of the LWDA, in conjunction with the State Board, the Office of Chancellor of the CA Community Colleges, the Department of Education, and the CA Postsecondary Education Commission to develop a strategic plan, containing specified elements, for connecting education and workforce development.

AB 1310 is scheduled to be heard by the Senate Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations on June 29, 2011.

Support: CA Business Education Association

CA Farm Bureau Federation

CA Manufacturers & Technology Association

CA Association of Leaders of Career Preparation

Oppose: None

MEETING SUMMARY
Issues and Policy Committee
April 5, 2011

In the Chair's absence, Mr. Sedlik led the meeting. Introductions were conducted.

Members Present:

Audrey Taylor (by phone)
Barry Sedlik (by phone)
Adam Peck (by phone)
Richard Rubin
Felicia Flourney (by phone)
Stewart Knox

Members Absent

Tim Rainey
Elvin Moon
Faye Huang
Jamil Dada

Staff

Daniel Patterson, staff to the Committee
Douglas Sale, Acting Executive Director
Luis Bermudez, staff to the Committee
John Williams, staff to the Committee
Adam Quinonez, staff to the Green Collar Jobs Council
Javier Romero, staff to the Green Collar Jobs Council
Moreen Lane, staff to the Health Care Workforce Development Council

Art O'Neal, Employment Development Department
Michael Evashenk, Employment Development Department
Loree Levy, Employment Development Department

Public

Barbara Halsey, California Workforce Association
Cheryl Moore, Ventura County
Denise Miller, Lake County OneStop

Updates:

Acting Executive Director Report

Mr. Sale provided an update on his discussions with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on a range of topics: State Board membership and new appointments, work of the State Board, and appointment of new Executive Director.

The Agency is aware of all these issues but will not be acted on for several months due to other Agency and Administration priorities.

He also spoke briefly of the work of the Green Collar Jobs Council and Health Workforce Council. The next State Board meeting is scheduled for May 17th and the major item for the Board will be the action on the local area modification application.

Health Workforce Development Council Report

Moreen Lane gave the report. She provided a briefing on the history of the Council and its charge. Current efforts focus mainly on the activities of completing the requirements of the planning grant and readying for applying for the healthcare implementation grants. Those grants are estimated to be between \$3 to \$4 million dollars and will be available around October 2011.

Green Collar Jobs Council Report

Javier Romero reported on Green Collar Jobs Council (GCJC). He provided a briefing of the GCJC and its work to date. The principal efforts currently are the Regional Industry Cluster of Opportunity grants (RICOG) and the State Energy Sector Partnership (SESP) grants. RICOG is moving into the fourth phase of activity, which is sustainability. RICOG efforts are showing that job creation is dependent upon regional industry clusters and that RICOG demonstrates the alignment of resources to target those industry clusters. SESP is a \$6 million grant that leverages six regional initiatives. GCJC saw the first year as focusing on the supply side. The GCJC cannot take a scattered approach to training and needs to address demand now. For the demand side they developed the business resource catalog, which currently contain 120 entries. The GCJC is attempting to counter the image that the state is not business friendly, and the catalog will speed up development of green resources and resources that can be leveraged. The Master Plan has been revised and the Annual Report has been completed and both have been accepted by the members.

Doug Sale stated that the California Unemployment Insurance Code mandates that the State Board engage/develop sector strategies. These Council reports show reports show that we are making progress, first in the green economy and now the health sector.

Employment Development Department (EDD)

Michael Evashenk provided a briefing on the expenditure of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds in California and EDD efforts to ensure they are using them wisely: there have been legislative hearings held on this matter. Quarterly reports for the period ending March 2011 are due April 20th. The report will tell us where we are and what additional actions we'll need to take. He spoke of the federal efforts on the Continuing Resolution and their impacts on WIA.

If WIA subcontracts not issued by June 30th, a state budget impasse may affect the local areas receiving their funding. Expenditure reports for the quarter ending December 2010 are included in agenda package. Once March 31st data is received, EDD will make it available.

Art O'Neal gave a report of the EDD's efforts on the Workforce Services Network Project and the performance reports for the quarter ending December 2010. A discussion about additional data elements ensued. Doug Sale stated request was for absolute numbers (actual number served) as opposed to percentages.

Mr. O'Neal state will need to run new report format. Mr. Rubin stated it would be useful to know how we are meeting our goals. Mr. Rubin also suggested that perhaps greater sharing of data would be possible between agencies to create some efficiencies.

Mr. O'Neal replied that the new system will enable historical data to be much closer to real time data and are estimating a revised implementation date of the new system of June 30, 2012, perhaps a couple months earlier. Common data will be possible with a common system that is client centered and that there will be an improvement in data reporting. Ad hoc reporting should also be easier. EDD is forming committee to address issues and procedures that arise during the implementation phase. Mr. Rubin stated that the Issues and Policy Committee could serve as such a committee. Mr. Sale replied that as the system is implemented, the Board may need to get involved in policy development. Mr. O'Neal stated the committee would be dealing with procedures as opposed to statewide policy and the benefit of purchasing an off the shelf system is we get the service to restructure data elements as part of the contract. We are in much better shape with a multi-state vendor who can revamp the reporting requirements.

Action: Meeting Summaries

Mr. Sedlik asked for a motion to approve the three meeting summaries. It was moved by Mr. Peck and seconded by Mr. Sedlik. Mr. Sale recommended some changes. Nancy Crooks, interim executive director of North Coast Counties Consortium (NCCC), wants to amend summary to add sixth bullet in Mr. Sale's summary that NCCC is willing to keep Lake County in the consortium and mend the relationship, and add a discussion where Mr. Sale asked the Lake County supervisor where if move resulted in significant reduction in funds, would move still take place; the answer was yes. No objections to changes were made. Meeting summaries approved unanimously.

Updates:

Local Plan Modification

Mr. Patterson stated that state legislation requires the State Board to develop statewide strategic plan, separate from the WIA Plan.

The staff at the State Board is working with EDD to formulate language of the local plan modification document. The planning process is being moved forward by six months to facilitate having an approved plan to be in place at the beginning of each Program Year (July 1). Mr. Rubin moved the item be approved and Ms. Taylor seconded. The item was approved unanimously.

High Concentration of Eligible Youth Awards

Mr. Patterson provided an update on this topic stating the new American Community Survey (ACS) data would be used to recalculate the local area's eligibility to apply for the high concentration of eligible youth grants. There were some changes that will be made to the Draft Directive once we receive the data and the budgeted amount has also been reduced to \$500,000. Ms. Taylor moved to approve and Mr. Rubin seconded. The item was approved unanimously.

WIA State Plan Extension

Mr. Patterson stated the Department of Labor (DOL) granted states the opportunity to request an extension of the current state plan and waivers. This request is due to DOL by April 15th, 2011. Labor and Workforce Development Secretary has already approved the request which will be sent to DOL for their action.

Scope of Work

It was noted that Mr. Rubin has to leave and quorum will be lost. The Branding of the system was presented to the State Board in May 2010 who referred the issue to the Committee. At the meeting of the workgroup it was recommended that because of varied stakeholder's interests, a consultant be contracted with to assist in this effort. Ms. Taylor read through minutes of the Fall State Board meeting and thought we were not moving forward on this; branding is going on at the national level, and new management information system may be associated with branding. She stated that we need to showcase our work not spend our efforts on Branding as every local board already has its own local brand. Mr. Patterson stated that this effort was suggested as a part of DOL's recent review. Scope of Work requires the consultant to review other brands being used and develop a single brand for statewide use for workforce investment. Ms. Taylor stated that moving something forward when money is important needs consideration; she does not doubt that branding is necessary, but would like to check out the national effort. She is concerned we are moving forward on a solicitation in uncertain time.

Ms. Flournoy stated that the national logo is available (Workforce Investment Works), which she has put on her materials.

Mr. Dada has stated in the past that there is no national branding scheme envisioned in WIA reauthorization language and the National Association of Workforce Boards (NAWB) effort is really a one stop location for informing legislators.

Ms. Levy stated that it is difficult to showcase work when identification of the system is fragmented. Ms. Taylor asked how our efforts are any different than national efforts. Mr. Sale stated that main purpose for NAWB website is a depository of information and not designed as public portal to link up to one stop services. It is principally designed for elected officials to access information about WIA. The state effort is designed to link to one stop services and that the costs are negligible.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern that the State Board will not be prepared for this scope of work as they stated they were not ready to move forward. Mr. Sale replied that the State Board referred this to the Committee for more staff work and that Mr. Dada and California Workforce Association (CWA) are ready to move forward.

Ms. Flournoy stated that the NAWB campaign was more than to inform congressmen, but part of a national effort to inform the public. Mr. Peck stated that Mr. Dada said there is no contradiction between NAWB effort and state branding. Mr. Knox affirmed that now is the time with CWA on board. Mr. Sale confirmed that the State Board has funding in its administrative budget, but can postpone it for a few more months. Mr. Sale feels Agency probably will support.

Ms. Taylor stated it might be a good time for branding to coincide with the implementation of new management information system. Mr. Evashenk agreed. Mr. Sale stated that we needed to bring the full recommendation to the August 2011 Board meeting. Mr. O'Neal stated that the July/August timeframe makes sure it gets integrated in new management information system. Mr. Patterson stated that there is still a lot of work to be done by August 2011 even if the scope of work is approved at May board meeting.

Ms. Taylor stated she does not have a clear understanding of what we are going to do. What is it going to cost at the local level? What does it encompass? How does it tie into other efforts? Mr. Sale stated the consultant would help to develop cost estimate for implementation. Mr. Patterson stated it is a performance based proposal, and will confirm the costs and hours when proposals are received. Strategy is to tie to local one stops, have a single portal for workforce investment. Mr. Sale states he is budgeting \$50,000. Ms. Taylor stated if we take it to the Board we need a clear presentation of purpose, what we are going to accomplish, and what will be the cost and the support of local areas. Ms. Flournoy stated what Ms. Taylor concerned about would get spelled out by consultant. That is what NAWB did and recommend we move forward for for the solicitation to go out and present it to the Board when proposals are in. Ms. Taylor agrees but not clear on purpose. Why do we need to brand? Ms. Flournoy states one stops are best kept secrets.

No matter what the current logo is, it keeps getting confused with the unemployment office. Ms. Taylor asked if we want the State Board to have this same conversation.

Ms. Taylor stated the brand shows we are a workforce system and at the second level how do we actually promote that brand. Can we do this in phases? Ms. Taylor suggested three phases. First is looking for brand concept, the second is how are we going to use it, and the third is implementation. Mr. Sale stated the scope of work could list the deliverables under the phases. Ms. Levy stated it is really good to use a consultant to get expertise and guidance to get brand identification and how do you use it.

Mr. Patterson explained how the staff developed the scope of work but will do some additional work and come back to workgroup. Mr. Sale asked do we still want to put revised scope of work before May board? Ms. Fournoy agrees with May board meeting. Mr. Peck wants part of discussion at May board meeting to include Agency input.

Mr. Sedlik warned that anytime you start talking about branding you start talking about lobbying. The position needs to be in the context that an effective brand is the means to communicate to the public and is therefore a cost savings. Branding is a red flag. It smacks of self promotion. Have to be sensitive to how this is characterized. It must be presented in such a way to show benefits to the public. Mr. Sale stated we are trying to increase accessibility to system. Mr. Sedlik stated needs to be positioned that way or otherwise appears too self serving. Ms. Moore recommended that this is really more of an outreach strategy rather than a branding effort. Mr. Sale asked if the issue should be put before State Board in May. Mr. Sedlik confirmed. The item can still be brought forward after spirited discussion. Mr. Patterson asked that written comments from member be provided to him on the scope of work in anticipation of this Board review.

There was no public comment or other business. Ms. Taylor asked if there will be a full State Board hearing on the local area modification request. Mr. Sale explained there will be a full hearing and he expects Lake County and others to be there.

The meeting was adjourned.

Item 4 Discussion

- State Board Meeting – Outreach Strategy Update
- Strategic Planning – Identification of Committee Work and Initiatives

Item 5 Public Comment

Item 6 Other Business